UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,550	09/15/2003	Eric Cosatto	2000-0042Con	2283
83224 7590 01/12/2010 AT & T LEGAL DEPARTMENT - NDQ ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING ONE AT & TWAY POOM 2A 207			EXAMINER	
			HAJNIK, DANIEL F	
ONE AT & T WAY, ROOM 2A-207 BEDMINSTER, NJ 07921			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/12/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/662,550	COSATTO ET AL.
Examiner-induced interview Gammary	Examiner	Art Unit
	DANIEL F. HAJNIK	2628
All Participants:	Status of Application: Nor	n-final
(1) <u>DANIEL F. HAJNIK</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Thomas Isaacson</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 7 January 2010	Time: <u>2:30</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: Double Patenting		
Claims discussed: Claims 22 and 23		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner called applicant to propose using a terminal disclaimer to overcome a double patenting rejection and perform any needed changes to the claims through examiner's amendment in order to put the case in condition for allowance. Applicant requested that a written office action be sent out showing the rejection in writing.